

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1057

GEORGE ROGER SIEGEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ARLINGTON COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
PLANNING HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT, and Its
Agencies; CRESCENT RESOURCES, LLC; FRANK
LASCH, Mid/Atlantic Property Manager;
ARLINGTON COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, 17th Circuit
Court and its Judges and Staff; UNITED STATES
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION; SECRETARY OF THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR;
UNKNOWN AGENTS, and Officers of Department of
the Interior; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA;
ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA; COMMONWEALTH
ATLANTIC PROPERTIES, INCORPORATED; CRESCENT
POTOMAC PROPERTIES, LLC; EDWARD M. SMITH, c/o
BM Smith & Associates,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 03-1220

GEORGE ROGER SIEGEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ARLINGTON COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT, and Its Agencies; CRESCENT RESOURCES, LLC; FRANK LASCH, Mid/Atlantic Property Manager; ARLINGTON COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, 17th Circuit Court and its Judges and Staff; UNITED STATES CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION; SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; UNKNOWN AGENTS, and Officers of Department of the Interior, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA; COMMONWEALTH ATLANTIC PROPERTIES, INCORPORATED; CRESCENT POTOMAC PROPERTIES, LLC; EDWARD M. SMITH, c/o BM Smith & Associates,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (CA-02-902-A)

Submitted: September 29, 2003 Decided: October 29, 2003

Before NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George Roger Siegel, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, George Roger Siegel appeals two orders of the district court. In No. 03-1057, he challenges the district court's order dismissing his complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We review de novo the district court's decision to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. Tillman v. Resolution Trust Corp., 37 F.3d 1032, 1034 (4th Cir. 1994). Having reviewed the record and finding no reversible error, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Siegel v. Arlington County Dep't of Community Planning, No. CA-02-902-A (E.D. Va. filed Dec. 2, 2002 & entered Dec. 5, 2002).

In No. 03-1220, Siegel appeals the district court's order denying his motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a), (b)(4). We review denial of a motion to correct a clerical mistake, Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a), for abuse of discretion. Kocher v. Dow Chem. Co., 132 F.3d 1225, 1229 (8th Cir. 1997). We find no such abuse of discretion. Siegel also moved for relief from judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4), asserting that the judgment was void. We review Rule 60(b)(4) motions de novo. New York Life Ins. Co. v. Brown, 84 F.3d 137, 142 (5th Cir. 1996). Having reviewed Siegel's allegations and the district court's ruling de novo, we conclude that the district court's order dismissing the action was not void or otherwise subject to attack.

We deny Siegel's motion to remand. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED